

### REMARKS

As a preliminary matter, Applicants thank the Examiner for the courtesy extended to their attorney, B. Joe Kim, during the telephone interview conducted on November 29, 2006.

In the interview, Applicants' attorney argued that the Satou et al. reference cited in rejecting claims 5 and 6 cannot be prior art to the subject application. A certified English translation of the priority document of the application was submitted in Amendment D filed on February 28, 2006 to perfect its priority date of July 5, 2002 over the U.S. filing date of April 29, 2003 of the Satou et al. reference. The Examiner agreed that Satou et al. is not prior art to the subject application and advised the Applicants to file a response requesting withdrawal of the final Office Action on this basis. The Examiner agreed to withdraw the final Office Action upon receipt of Applicant's response. The subject Response is filed in accordance with the Examiners instructions.

Claims 5 and 6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamazaki et al. (6,603,453) in view of Yamazaki et al. (2001/0052950), Nakajima et al. and Satou et al. As discussed above and in the telephone interview conducted on November 29, 2006, the Satou et al. reference is not prior art to the subject application. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Reconsideration and allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

The Examiner should contact Applicants' undersigned attorney if a telephone conference would expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.

By

  
B. Joe Kim

December 18, 2006

Suite 2500  
300 South Wacker Drive  
Chicago, Illinois 60606  
(312) 360-0080  
Customer No. 24978